## Remarks/Argument

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

### Claim Status

Claims 1-20 were previously presented. Claims 1-8, 19 and 20 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 10, 11, 13 and 16 are amended. Claims 9-18 are now pending.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-8, 10 and 19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Yamamoto (US 7,167,258). In response, with respect to claim 10, applicant traverses the rejections. Claims 1-8 and 19 are canceled without prejudice, rendering their rejections moot.

Claim 10 recites that an image scanning device comprises:

> ...means for controlling...when a copying instruction is input during the network printing process, to scan an image and to accumulate scanned image data until a means for storing reaches a prescribed accumulation amount, and when the means for storing reaches the prescribed accumulation amount, to stop the scanning...

Thus, as described in paragraphs 0069-0072 and illustrated in FIG. 10 of applicant's specification, when an image scanning device (scanner device 1) receives a copy instruction during a network printing process (while printer device 2 is printing), scanner device 1 scans an image and accumulates scanned image data until a prescribed accumulation amount in the means for storing (a page, a line, etc.) is reached, at which time scanning is stopped. When storage capacity recovers (by progress of the network printing process), scanning resumes and, when the network printing process is finished, the accumulated scanned image data is output by scanner device 1 to printer device 2.

Yamamoto does not teach or suggest such a configuration. As shown in Yamamoto's FIG. 1, host computer 400 is connected to laser printer 300 and image scanner 200 in parallel. In a print process, host computer 400 provides print data directly to laser printer 300. The print data is not routed through image scanner

\\\LA - 081710/000266 - 414838 v1

Appl. No. 10/783,214
Amdt. dated January 14, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2008

Atty. Ref. 81710.0266
Customer No. 26021

200 as in applicant's invention. Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Yamamoto that, when a copy instruction is received by image scanner 200 while laser printer 300 is printing, image scanner 200 stores scanned image data up to a prescribed accumulation amount.

The Action asserts that Yamamoto's col. 11, lines 20-35, teaches these features of claim 10. Applicant strongly disagrees. First, and importantly, the cited portion of Yamamoto explains the arrangement of a control system for an image output device, i.e., laser beam printer 300, and not for an image scanning device as is required by claim 10.

Moreover, even if this portion of Yamamoto were directed to an image scanning device, which it is not, there is still no disclosure of the features of claim 10. This portion of Yamamoto discloses that printer 300 includes a CPU 301 that systematically controls access to devices connected to a system bus 310 on the basis of a control program stored in ROM 303 or in external storage device 305, and outputs an image signal from printer engine 306. Printer 300 also includes a communication control section 308 that notifies a host computer about information in the printer. There is no disclosure or suggestion that printer 300 accumulates scanned image data until a means for storing reaches a prescribed accumulation amount, and then stops scanning until storage becomes available, as is required by claim 10.

Since Yamamoto does not disclose each and every feature of claim 10, it cannot anticipate claim 10, and the rejection of claim 10 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yamamoto in view of Danknick (US 6,856,416). Claims 11 and 16 are rejected as obvious over Yamamoto in view of Rosenlund (US 6,738,155). Claims 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yamamoto in view of Maeda (US 6,557,033). Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yamamoto in

\\\LA - 061710/000266 - 414825 v1

Appl. No. 10/783,214
Amdt. dated January 14, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2008

Atty. Ref. 81710.0266
Customer No. 26021

view of Maeda, and further in view of Danknick. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Yamamoto in view of Rosenlund, and further in view of Danknick. In response, for similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 10, applicant traverses the rejections.

Claims 9, 11-13 and 16 recites similar limitations as those discussed above for claim 10. For example, claims 9, 11-13 and 16 recite an image scanning device having "a means for controlling...when a copying instruction is input during the network printing process, to scan an image and to accumulate scanned image data until a means for storing reaches a prescribed accumulation amount...". As discussed for claim 10, Yamamoto does not teach or suggest this feature.

Danknick, Rosenlund and Maeda do not remedy the deficiencies of Yamamoto. Danknick is directed to allocation of a print job among multiple printers and is not relevant to an image scanning device that accumulates scanned image data. Maeda relates to recognition by a host of whether a device is connected and is likewise not relevant to the subject matter of claims 9, 11-13 and 16.

Rosenlund is directed to a printing and publishing system providing prepress, content management, infrastructure, and workflow services to system subscribers in real time using a communication network (Abstract). The Action asserts that col. 6, lines 4-14 of Rosenlund teaches that an image scanning device accumulates scanned image data when a printer is in a printing process and the image scanning device receives a copy instruction. Applicant strongly disagrees. The cited passage of Rosenlund discloses that a hierarchical storage management (HSM) system 120 includes redundant arrays of inexpensive disks (RAID) for providing multi-tiered storage an automatic archiving and backup of electronic files communicated across a private network 160 or public network 190, and bears no relevance to an image scanning device that accumulates scanned image data when a printer is in a printing process and the image scanning device receives a copy instruction.

For these reasons, claims 9, 11-13 and 16 are not obvious over Yamamoto in view of any of Danknick, Rosenlund or Maeda. Claims 14, 15, 17 and 18 depend,

\\\LA - 081710/300390 - 414328 v1

Appl. No. 10/783,214
Amdt. dated January 14, 2009
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2008

Atty. Ref. 81710.0266
Customer No. 26021

respectively, from claims 13 and 16 and are similarly allowable. The rejections of
claims 9 and 11-18 under 35 USC 103 should therefore be withdrawn. Claim 20 is
canceled without prejudice, rendering its rejection moot.

### Conclusion

This application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited
to contact the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after consideration and
entry of this amendment. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our
Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: January 14, 2009

By: _____

Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601

\\\LA - 81710/300286 - 414328 v1